

Application No.: 09/878,536
Final Office Action dated August 26, 2005
RCE Dated: January 26, 2005

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Final Office Action mailed August 26, 2005. An appropriate Petition for Extension of Time to Respond is submitted herewith, together with the appropriate fee.

Claims 1-39 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-39. The present Reply amends claims 1-7, 9-24, 26-39 and adds claims 40-41, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-41. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Final Office Action mailed August 26, 2005, Claims 1-39 were pending in the Application. In the Final Office Action mailed August 26, 2005, it was noted that several sheets of a submitted IDS were mistakenly submitted. Claims 1-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim that which Applicant regard as the invention. Claims 1-2, 5-13, 15-19, 22-30 and 32-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiederhold (U.S. Patent No. 6,226,745) in view of Devine et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,606,708). Claims 3-4 and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiederhold in view of Devine and further in view of javaworld.com. Claims 14 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiederhold in view of Devine and further in view of javaworld.com and java.sun.com.

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendments

The present Response amends Claims 1-7, 9-24 and 26-39, and adds Claim 40-41, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-41. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute any originally presented claims in a continuing or future application.

- 9 -

Attorney Docket No.: BEAS-01084US0
Jmissud/beas/10847us0/1084us0.8.26.05 FOA Reply.doc

Application No.: 09/878,536
Final Office Action dated August 26, 2005
RCE Dated: January 26, 2005

III. Information Disclosure Statement

For the IDS submitted on 6/30/2005, the Examiner initialed two sheets of prior art labeled with the above-identified application number, 09/878,536, on 7/5/2005. Several other sheets, labeled with application numbers 10/122,599 and 10/367,462, were mistakenly attached to the submission. Please disregard the sheets labeled with application numbers 10/122,599 and 10/367,462.

IV. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Office Action mailed August 26, 2005, Claims 1-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim that which Applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, Claims 1-7, 8-24, and 26-39 have been amended by the current Response to correct any indefiniteness. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as amended, together with the claims dependent therefrom, now properly conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-2, 5-13, 15-19, 22-30, 32-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiederhold (US 6,226,745) in view of Devine et al. (US 6,606,708). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection by demonstrating below that the claims are neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of Wiederhold in view of Devine.

Claim 1

Claim 1, as currently amended, defines an application interface mechanism for receiving a request from a client to access a protected application or resource. The client makes the request on the application container, and the *application container* calls the security server with the request and a *callback handler*. The security service includes a plurality of security providers that may be plugged into the security service, and which use the callback handler to request *context information* from the application container for the request. Depending on the output from the security providers, the security service determines *require at least one of business logic and functionality entitlements* for the client to use with the protected application.

- 10 -

Attorney Docket No.: BEAS-01084US0
Jmissud/beas/10847us0/1084us0.8.26.05 FOA Reply.doc

Application No.: 09/878,536
Final Office Action dated August 26, 2005
RCE Dated: January 26, 2005

Devine, on the other hand, teaches a secure server architecture for web based data management. A double firewalled system is disclosed for protecting remote enterprise servers that provide communication services to telecommunication network customers from unauthorized third parties. Data security protocols provide for an identification of the user, and an authentication of the user, and a determination of entitlements that the user may avail themselves of within the enterprise system. (Abstract).

Claim 1 requires use of a *callback handler* to request *context information* from the application container. This *context information* is the setting in which the access request is made. (Spec. p. 6, para 0018). The context information includes the identity of the target (if available), the values of the request's parameters, the values of profile attributes associated with the initiating principal, potentially environmental information such as the network or IP address of the initiating client, and potentially other information. (Spec. p. 13, para 0010 and 0044). The context information is typically utilized as values of parameters in an expression that is to be evaluated by a rules or expression evaluation engine. (Spec. p. 13, para 0045). Callbacks to application containers from the authorization provider provide context information without prior knowledge of any business policies. (Spec. p. 16, para 0054). Utilizing a *callback handler* that is passed from the container to the implementation of the Service Provider Interfaces, the provider is capable of requesting specific context information be returned. When the container's *callback handler* is called, the container responds by populating the callbacks with the appropriate values. Neither the application, nor the container is aware of changes to business policy since they are queried for context information that is driven by the evaluation of specific business policy expressions. (Spec. p. 16, para 0055).

Devine, on the other hand, does not teach a *callback handler* or *context information*. Devine does not use callbacks to request context information. Instead, Devine teaches that when a user logs into a specific application with a ID and password, an application server retrieves user entitlements for that application from a StarOE server. (col. 27, lines 15-18). Devine teaches that the user logs into the specific application on a Web Page (col. 27, line 34) using a GUI interface. (Fig. 6). The user's entitlements as used in Devine are limited to the permit or deny concept. As defined in Devine, entitlements represent specific services to which the user has subscribed and has privilege to access. (Col. 16, lines 46-47). Thus, the server application is only requesting permissions information for a specific application from the StarOE server for the user. Neither the application server nor the StarOE server request any context information related to the user's

- 11 -

Attorney Docket No.: BEAS-01084US0
Jmissud/beas/10847us0/1084us0.8.26.05 FOA Reply.doc

Application No.: 09/878,536
Final Office Action dated August 26, 2005
RCE Dated: January 26, 2005

request to access the specific application in order to determine a user's entitlements. Because neither server is requesting context information, neither server uses callbacks or callback handlers. Further, neither server is the same thing as an application container, as required by Claim 1, because neither server is receiving a request for context information. Further, the GUI interface into which the user logs on to the application, does not read on the use of callbacks and call back handlers because the GUI interface only handles the means by which the user makes a request to access an application. Thus, Devine does not teach callbacks, callback handlers, use of context information or application containers, as required by Claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiment as defined in Claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of Wiederhold or Devine, taken alone or in combination, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the claim.

Claims 18 and 35

The comments provided above with respect to Claim 1 are incorporated herein by reference. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 18 and 35 are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, taken alone or in combination, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 5-13, 15-17, 19, 22-30 and 32-39

Claims 2, 5-13, 15-17, 19, 22-30 and 32-39 are not addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

Claims 3-4 and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiederhold (U.S. Patent No. 6,226,745) in view of Devine et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,606,708) and further in view of javaworld.com.

- 12 -

Attorney Docket No.: BEAS-01084US0
Jm1ssud/beas/10847us0/1084us0.8.26.05 FOA Reply.doc

Application No.: 09/878,536
Final Office Action dated August 26, 2005
RCE Dated: January 26, 2005

Claims 3-4 and 20-21

Claims 3-4 and 20-21 are not addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

Claims 14 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiederhold (U.S. Patent No. 6,226,745) in view of Devine et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,606,708) and further in view of javaworld.com and java.sun.com.

Claims 14 and 31

Claims 14 and 31 are not addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

VI. New Claims

Claim 40

New Claim 40 depends from independent Claim 1. Claim 40 requires that entitlements comprise *at least one of business logic and functionality entitlements*. A client may use these types of entitlements with the protected application, as entitlements reflect not only the technical aspects of the secure environment (the permit or deny concept), but can be used to represent the business

- 13 -

Attorney Docket No.: BEAS-01084US0
Jmissud/beas/10847us0/1084us0.8.26.05 FOA Reply.doc

Application No.: 09/878,536
Final Office Action dated August 26, 2005
RCE Dated: January 26, 2005

logic or functionality required by the server provider. (Spec., p. 6-7, para 0018). These entitlements clearly denote what a particular user may or may not do with a particular resource, in a particular context. (Spec., p. 6, para 0018). An example of this entitlements capability is provided in a business example of "Can Dr. Smith update Jon Joe's medical chart?" (Spec., p.7, para 0019). Using the entitlements required by claim 1, it is possible to add the necessary context of who's the patient in question. For example, if Dr. Smith is Jon Joe's personal physician or perhaps an attending physician, Dr. Smith is entitled to update Jon Joe's chart. In a permission-based authorization system, on the other hand, this context is absent, as the resource is "medical chart" object, the request is to 'update' and the Subject is 'Dr. Smith.' Dr. Smith, in this case, either has permission or does not have permission to update the medical chart.

Devine is such a permission-based authorization system. Entitlements as used in Devine are limited to the permit or deny concept. As defined in Devine, entitlements represent specific services to which the user has subscribed and has privilege to access. (Col. 16, lines 46-47). A user may have read and write privileges with respect to one application and only read privileges with respect to another application. (Col. 27, lines 21-23). These read and write privileges are standard read and write permissions found in many permission-based authorization systems. Thus Devine does not teach business logic or functionality entitlements, as required in Claim 40. Applicant submits that Claim 40 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, taken alone or in combination, and consideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 41

New Claim 41 depends from Claim 1. Claim 41 requires that *context information* comprises at least one of the identity of the protected resource or application, one or more values of access request parameters and network or internet protocol address of the client. The comments provided above with respect to Claim 1 regarding context information are incorporated herein by reference. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 41 is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, taken alone or in combination, and consideration thereof is respectfully requested.

- 14 -

Attorney Docket No.: BEAS-01084US0
Jmissud/beas/10847us0/1084us0.8.26.05 FOA Reply.doc

Application No.: 09/878,536
Final Office Action dated August 26, 2005
RCE Dated: January 26, 2005

VII. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if she can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including January 26, 2005.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 26, 2006

By: Julie Daniels Missud
Julie Daniels Missud
Reg. No. 51,330

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer No. 23910

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

- 15 -

Attorney Docket No.: BEAS-01084US0
Jmissud/beas/10847us0/1084us0.8.26.05 FOA Reply.doc

BEST AVAILABLE COPY